DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 878 RC 005 424

AUTHOR Zeller, Frederick A.; Miller, Robert W.

TITLE Problems of Community Action in Appalachia.

INSTITUTION West Virginia Univ., Morgantown. West Virginia Center for Appalachian Studies and Development.

PUB DATE May 68

NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Action Programs (Community); Citizen Participation; Community Characteristics; Community Service Programs; Employment Programs; *Federal Programs; Political Power; Poverty Programs; Power Structure; *Problems; Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Areas; Sociocultural Patterns

IDENTIFIERS *Appalachia; Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

ABSTRACT

Dealing with an analysis and evaluation of community action programs (provided for by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964) in Appalachia, this report presents 3 conditions for program success: (1) adequate community action leadership at the local level; (2) power holders at the community, county, or "local" level who are sympathetic, or at least neutral, to accomplishment of the goals of community action; and (3) involvement of the target population in the community action programs. After an evaluation of the state of these 3 conditions in community action programs in Appalachia, it is concluded that the conditions are unattained and it is recommended that the development of adequate community action leadership at the local level be given top priority "since the other 2 conditions probably must be taken as 'givens' until the development of effective leadership is accomplished." (BO)

ED054878

UD009714 level

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

research series **4**

problems of community action in appalachia

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
Appalachian Center • West Virginia University • Morgantown

RC005424

1

Problems of Community Action In Appalachia

RECEIVED
NOV 10 1970
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

by

Frederick Zeller
Associate Professor of Economics
and Director, Office of Research and Development
West Virginia University

Robert W. Miller
Professor of Psychology
St. Lawrence University

Research Series 4

Office of Research and Development
Appalachian Center
West Virginia University, Morgantown
May 1968

Series 68 No. 9-9 6M .15

Preface

West Virginia University's Appalachian Center is dedicated to bringing knowledge needed for effective decision-making to those who plan and work for the betterment of the State and the Appalachian Region of which this State is a part. The need for knowledge is great – especially the concentration of knowledge in the social and physical sciences. Moreover, the needed information spans a number of methodologies. For its generation known principles must be collected and applied, and in other instances, use must be made of empirical investigations.

The most important function of the Appalachian Center's Office of Research and Development is to produce the type of knowledge that is vital for rational social and economic decisions of its leadership audiences in the State and the Region, and the Center's staff of programmers and field educators located on the University's Campus and throughout the counties. The Office of Research and Development supports a variety of research conducted both by its own staff and other components of West Virginia University.

This paper, dealing with an analysis and evaluation of Community Programs in Appalachia, is an effort to assess the value of such programs for the Region's development. It is suggested that certain policy changes may be needed for community action to achieve its potential.

FREDERICK A. ZELLER, *Director*
Office of Research and Development
Appalachian Center
West Virginia University

I

Introduction

Among current Federal programs intended to combat poverty, perhaps the most notable and innovative have been the approaches provided for by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Of these approaches, the community action programs developed in accord with Sections 204 and 205 of the Act have been both the most controversial and the most fruitful in generating successful new departures of attack on a variety of causes and symptoms of poverty. In general, community action programs must conform to established federal guidelines to qualify for financial support, but a major intent also is to encourage meaningful planning and execution at the local level. To illustrate:

> "The purpose of federal assistance to community action programs is to help urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty. Because community needs and resources differ widely, considerable latitude is allowed in the development and conduct of a community action program."[1]

Other aspects of the community action concept which are related to the principle of local planning, but which also are significant in their own right as important new approaches to social problems include: stress on the organization and maximum feasible participation of low-income groups in community decision-making processes; and the notion that action agencies have an important role to play in facilitating community-wide integration and coordination of both new and existing approaches to the problems of poverty.

Several types of specific projects can be sponsored under the umbrella of community action programs. Chief among these are those designed to qualify the poor for employability, or employability at more productive jobs, and programs of a "service" nature, such as homemaker, consumer, education, and health services.

Presumably, projects at the local level which aim to spur economic development to create more and better paying jobs are to be established under different federal legis-

---

[1]Community Action Program Guide, Vol. 1, Office of Economic Opportunity 1965, p. 7.

lation, although some types of community action projects might contribute toward this end directly or indirectly. In any event, the long-term hope for community action is

> "to effect a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities afflicted by poverty to deal effectively with their own problems so that they need no further assistance."[2]

This paper suggests that certain conditions must be met if community action programs are to be successful to the maximum extent possible. Another aim is to evaluate the probability that these conditions are being, or will be met in rural areas. The basis for the evaluation rests in an application of existing data and theory, as well as in the authors' experiences with a number of ongoing community action programs in West Virginia and other states in the Appalachian Region. The analysis presented in this paper thus is relevant primarily for the rural counties of the Appalachian Region, although it may have some relevance for rural areas in general.

II

Conditions For Success

There are at least three different but interrelated conditions which must be met if community action programs are to succeed.

The first of these conditions is that **adequate community action leadership must exist at the local level.** Furthermore, those who assume leadership roles must be willing and able to work within the scope of Sections 204 and 205 to accomplish their purpose. In other words, there must be leaders at the local level who understand the philosophy and aims of the Economic Opportunity Act and are committed to their implementation.

In addition, such individuals must possess the ability and aggressiveness necessary to acquire the money resources required for community action success. They must be able to devise and initiate projects which both reflect local needs and provide realistic opportunities for the development of economic, social and political conditions which will

[2] *Ibid.*, p .7.

answer them. And, finally, they must insure that those projects are executed effectively.

Our experience indicates that individuals who fill such leadership positions may come from various sources. They may be members of the action agency's governing board, they may be volunteers. Or, conceivably, they could be trators, professional and non-professional personnel, or they may be volunteers. Or, conceivability, they could be people from any of a number of other sources at the local level, although we are unaware of instances in which this clearly is the case.

The second condition necessary for community action success, and which has a direct bearing on the first, is that **those who "wield the power" at the community, county or "local" level must be sympathetic, or at least neutral, to accomplishment of the goals of community action.** When this condition prevails there are less likely to be significant efforts to block or hamper the action agency's projects.

The third condition which must be satisfied is that **the people who are the targets of the community action programs—the poor—must respond to projects intended to help them.** As mentioned previously, recognition of the importance of this factor was built into the design of the community action concept through stress on participation of low-income groups in community decision-making processes. For example:

> "A vital feature of every community action program is the involvement of poor themselves - the residents of the areas and members of the groups to be served - in planning, policy-making, and operations of the program."[3]

Presumably, if the poor or their representatives are involved in the planning and execution of projects, the nature of the projects will reflect their needs and interests and, hence, they could be expected to support them.

III

Progress and Power

Turning first to an evaluation of the influence of the power-wielders on the success of community action efforts, several approaches can be taken. One is to consider com-

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

munity action as a form of economic development and consider the relationship between such development and the influence of men-of-power.

It long has been recognized that economic development is heavily dependent upon certain types of economic leadership referred to variously as "entrepreneurial ability",[4] the "industrializing elite",[5] or simply "the elite".[6]

While these concepts were developed with reference to the economic development of entire countries, especially underdeveloped countries, there is no reason to believe that similar leadership is any less important for the economic development of underdeveloped communities or areas within countries, even though the precise nature of the leadership may be different among the various situations.

However, in the present context we are not so much concerned with the economic leadership of local men-of-power as with their reactions to community action efforts. A cursory examination of the literature leads to the conclusion that they would tend to oppose such efforts.

For example, it has been suggested that leadership for the development of an underdeveloped area may not be provided by the area's customary leaders since economic innovations (we are including community action efforts in this category) are marginal to the traditional order[7]. It is logical to infer from this that economic development and community action efforts probably will be resisted by customary leaders for that very reason.

Along the same lines, a community's leaders may not respond positively to newly available opportunities for economic development because of their vested interests in

[4]See, for example, Joseph A. Schumpeter, *The Theory of Economic Development*, Galaxy Ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961).

[5]Clark Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Frederick H. Harbison, and Charles A. Myers, *Industrialism and Industrial Man* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961).

[6]Joseph J. Spengler, "Theory, Ideology, Non-Economic Values, and Politics-Economic Development". *Tradition, Values and Socio-Economic Development*, Ralph Braibanti and Joseph J. Spengler, eds. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1961) pp. 29-30.

[7]Wilbert E. Moore, "The Social Framework of Economic Development', *Tradition, Values . . .*, op. cit., p. 79.

the **status quo** or because "they are isolated from many of the problems which affect the average citizen".[8]

A somewhat different line of analysis suggests that American society is characterized by groups which tend to conflict in striving to satisfy their own interests, but that those groups which control the decision-making process (the "elite") are linked in a consensus relationship of "core" beliefs which is more durable than their conflict relationships.[9] The conclusion is that this consensus tends to prevent the possibility of the basic social changes necessary for the substantial reduction of poverty.[10]

Turning more specifically to the Appalachian Region, a recent study indicates that a fundamental difference between the lower and the upper classes of the Region is that the latter are more integrated into the larger American society. At the same time, the upper classes recognize that those outside the Region regard them in terms of a more-or-less deviant Appalachian stereotype, which is a situation they dislike. Thus:

> Primarily because of self-preservation, some of the middle class, and especially the upper class, are very critical of those in poverty. Had they not sensed their inclusion in the Appalachian stereotype, they would probably be less critical. Rarely then does one find a member of the upper class or even an individual of lesser means who is highly integrated into the larger society, who does not criticize the behavior of the indigent.[12]

Turning from the several general lines of inquiry cited above which indicate that men-of-power may well tend to oppose community action, what has been the actual experience in Appalachia? Data from systematic study bearing on this question are not available. However, some information has been produced by a preliminary evaluation of a

---

[8]Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure*, Anchor Books Edition (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963). See the entire work.

[9]Marc Pilisuk and Thomas Hayden, "Is There a Military Industrial Complex Which Presents Peace?: Consensus and Countervailing Power in Pluralistic Systems", *The Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. XXI, No. 3 (July 1965) pp. 88-91.

[10]*Ibid.* pp, 93-9.

[11]John D. Photiadis, "Rural Southern Appalachia and Mass Society, An Overview", (Morgantown: Office of Research and Development, West Virginia University) mimeo. pp. 13-14.

[12]*Ibid.*, p. 14.

training project designed to train union leaders in Appalachia to function in community action projects.[13]

Reports from the trainees generally confirm the expectation that community men-of-power will tend to oppose community action efforts which show promise of effectiveness, although it should be added that the small number of effective community action programs which existed at the time of our evaluation in the areas in which the trainees reside provide a limited number of cases from which to generalize.

In conclusion, there seems to be no theoretical or empirical basis for anticipating the widespread support of effective community action programs by Appalachia's men-of-power. This conclusion does not rule out effective community action. It does mean that the other two conditions which are prerequisities for effectiveness must be met more perfectly if community action is to succeed.

IV

Progress and the Poor

Another of the three conditions which we have suggested must be met, if community action programs are to succeed, is that the poor themselves must respond to the programs. Our analysis of the probability that this condition can be met is based on several known factors which tend to create difficulties even when the poor are confronted with carefully conceived and well executed projects.

In part, the Economic Opportunity Act and its subsequent administration have been based upon the assumption that if "appropriate" opportunities to ease the burden of poverty (i.e., those developed and executed with the participation of the poor, or their representatives) are made available and publicized, positive response from the target population will be automatic.

Obviously, there is a truism in this in that it could be claimed that "appropriate" projects will generate a posi-

[13]The project, "Leadership Training for Community Action", is financed largely by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is headquartered at the Institute for Labor Studies, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University. Approximately 100 union leaders from ten Appalachian States are included in the project.

tive response. But at the same time, it would appear that the present strategy of some community action programs is built in part on a model of human behavior which resembles the concept of an "economic man". That is, the assumptation is that the poor will respond to conventional opportunities to maximize, or optimize, their economic gain.

Another way of putting the matter is that, despite efforts to avoid it, a considerable degree of community action strategy may yet contain what might be termed a middle-class bias. Most programs are staffed with middle class individuals, and despite the ritualistic acceptance of the concept of maximum participation of the poor in planning, programs are being run on the assumption that the poor will respond to the same motivational appeals effective with the middle-class. Yet, studies indicate that the poor, and especially the Appalachian poor, in contrast to the typical middle-class American, are quite unlikely to respond to what the middle-class would define as "opportunities."

One such study reached the conclusion that economic rehabilitation programs by themselves may be inadequate to insure the economic recovery of depressed communities because their inhabitants may have developed attitudes of "resignation" and patterns of behavior which are antithetical to changes such as those originating from industrial innovation.[14]

A study of Southern Appalachian migrants to a northern city, a group which by many standards possesses more conventional characteristics than the non-migrants, found them to be persons who "do not understand or reach out for help easily because of their lack of understanding of community agencies, coupled with their Puritan values of self-help."[15]

And another study which focused on inhabitants of

[14]Herman R. Lantz, "Resignation, Industrialization, and the Problem of Social Change: A Case History of a Coal Mining Community," *Blue Collar World*, Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg, eds. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958).

[15]William E. Powles, "The Southern Appalachian Migrant: Country Boy Turned Blue Collarite", *Blue Collar World*, op. cit., p. 281. For a more extended discussion of Puritanism see Ralph Barton Perry, *Puritanism and Democracy*, (New York: Harper and Row: Publishers, 1944).

Appalachia found that the more impoverished of them lack an adequate sense of civic responsibility, possess a "relief" philosphy, have difficulty accepting the requirements of an associational type of society, believe that solutions for the Region's problems are a national responsibility, and accept the goals of an urban, industrial society but not the related, necessary means.[16]

It should be added that in the experience of the authors the means to reach the goals of industrial society may not even be available in Appalachia or, if available, may not so much be rejected as judged to be irrelevant in view of the lack of realistic opportunities to apply them.

Finally, another analysis of the Appalachian poor points out that attempts to effect social change in the Region could conceivably threaten or even disorganize those who are the targets of the helping projects[17]

Thus, the available evidence in combination with critical analysis would seem to clear that community action programs designed for the poverty-stricken of Appalachia must deal with problems which have deep roots. Very simply, many of the poor of Appalachia seem unable or unwilling to accept conventional opportunities presented in conventional ways.

This factor, and the apparent tendency of the Region's men-of-power not to support community action programs, consequently create a situation in which the role of the community action program leader takes on paramount importance for community action success.

V

Progress and Program Leadership

Of the three conditions which we have suggested are crucial to community action success, program leadership remains to be analyzed. As implied above, it is our conviction that within the Appalachian Region, effective program leadership is the most indispensable of the three

---

[16]Thomas R. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism", *The Southern Appalachian Region*, Ford, ed. (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962) pp. 31-2.

[17]Photiadis, *op cit*. See the entire work.

effective leadership, by itself, is an important factor in program success, but also because such leadership can counterbalance the negative influences of a conservative power structure and an apathetic target population, which, as has been indicated, are serious barriers to community action.

One criterion for effective community action leadership is success in acquiring the necessary finances to support needed projects. Community programs generally are conceived to be instruments for gathering together all available resources — federal, state, and local — to combat poverty.

However, the various sources of financial support for a particular community action agency may or may not appear in the agency's budget. So, it is difficult to evaluate the efforts of community program leaders to acquire dollar support, although it is our impression that the efforts in the Appalachian Region have not been as strenuous and effective as they should have been, measured either in absolute terms or in comparison to other geographic regions.*

We have also been aware of several community action programs in the Region which have had difficulty getting off the ground because the staff members and governing boards of the agencies were unable to conceptualize promising projects. Moreover, many projects which are funded do not achieve their aims.

Although more research is necessary to account for these difficulties, we have studied in some depth one program in an Appalachian state in order to determine what the problematic variables associated with effective program leadership might be.

This program, described below, cannot be considered to be representative of other programs in the Region in all, or even most respects. Indeed, our reason for studying it was that even though the program was fairly elaborate and operated on an unusually large budget, it was failing to

*Garth Mangum has noted, for example, that per capita federal expenditures for education in a number of Appalachian states were well below the national average in fiscal 1965. Also, per capita MDTA expenditures in all Appalachian states except New York during 1965 were below the national average. "Manpower Implications of the Appalachian Regional Programs", mimeo., p. 14.

"reach" any appreciable portion of its target population. The method of our study consisted essentially of talking with the program's staff, observing their relationships with each other, and talking with a number of impartial observers who were familiar with the program.

The program was organized in a coal-hollow county* which has had extremely high unemployment rates, considerable out-migration of younger people, and has more than one-third of its population on public assistance.

Apart from several communities, all with less than 10,000 people, the population is scattered among the hollows in what might be called sub-communities. Among the poor, levels of housing, sanitation, health and other indicators of material well-being are extremely low. The terrain of the county is so rugged that it is difficult to imagine that any additional industry would be likely to locate in the area.

In brief, the problems which stand in the way of the goal of substantially reducing poverty in the area are enormous in the short-run. At the very least, it is clear that no combination of presently available resources would be sufficient to achieve that goal. Even so, in our judgement such situations can still profit from effective community action programs.

The action program in the county consists mainly of the operation of about ten multi-purpose area centers. Within the centers, various services are made available, including basic adult education, homemaking education, library, tutoring for children in school, Head-Start, recreation for young people and adults, and support for programs such as 4-H and Boy Scouts.

The County-wide staff is composed of more than 100 administrators, professionals, and non-professionals, the latter intended to be indigenous leaders. Most of the staff's activity is directed toward encouraging people in the target population to come to the centers and make use of the services available in them, although some effort is being made to have extensive contacts with these people in their

*The description of the County, and its community action program is deliberately vague since nothing is to be gained from its identification. The description would be equally applicable to dozens of Southern Appalachian communities.

homes and neighborhoods for the purpose of considering neighborhood problems.

Many of the staff openly admitted their belief that not many of the people the program was intended to reach were coming to the centers and, hence, in their judgment and ours as well, the program was not as effective as they had hoped it would be. Several of them reported cases in which people were bypassing the community centers to obtain certain services elsewhere because of their belief they would obtain better results in that manner.

When asked about the reasons for the reluctance of people to come to the centers, the staff indicated three apparent causes.

First, it was pointed out that many of the low-income people were unable to get to the centers because they lacked transportation. Under the prevailing transportation system, the few poor who own cars charge the others rather steep prices for trips which might be made to obtain food and other necessities. This problem is heightened by the dispersal of the low-income population and by the area's rough terrain which precludes walking any appreciable distances.

A second reason expressed by some, but seemingly subscribed to by most of the staff, is that people in the target population are not sufficiently motivated to come to the centers. This reason was elaborated in the following terms:

"Those people are not concerned for themselves."
"They won't come for classes."
"The programs are not meeting the people's interests."
"Those people don't want to rise to succeed.'
"The poor are willing to help others but not themselves."

Some of the staff believed more of the poor would come if the centers had courses they do not presently offer. Examples used most frequently were typing and knitting classes for women and woodworking classes for men. At the same time, many on the staff were not willing to consider the addition of such classes on the grounds that this type of instruction was not what the people needed.

A third factor mentioned in accounting for the failure of the centers was that the poor tend to see participation

in the centers' activities as a source of embarrassment. This was illustrated in terms of some of the poor being relatively more poorly dressed than others or lacking the verbal and social skills necessary for the type of interaction required to participate in the centers' programs.

It was clear, however, that most of the staff believed that the poor had not responded to the community action program because they accept and perhaps are satisfied with their present way of life.

The one group within the staff which tended to take exception to this was the non-professional workers, who comprise only a small fraction of the total staff, who indicated that the poor wanted the opportunity to advance but that the programs of the center were not seen to be relevant to them. Some of them stressed the need to work directly with the poor to help them identify and solve their most immediate problems while at the same time organizing them for further action.

These staff members, themselves from the target population, seemed to reveal an implicit recognition and acceptance of the motivational valve of organization itself, something that the more middle-class staff members either would not, or could not accept.

Most of the staff seemed convinced that the future strategy of the community action program should be the same as it had been, despite the apparent contradiction between that point of view and the reality of the situation. While admitting that they did not expect this strategy to be any more effective in the future than it has been in the past, they apparently believed that people in the target population **should** respond to it.

In other words, the present program was perceived as the "right" one and if it did not work, nothing else should be attempted. Some of the staff indicated that perhaps if they were given some training in "communicating with and motivating the poor" their strategy could be made to work.

Having made up their minds about how people in the target groups **should** participate in community action, a significantly large number of the staff was overtly critical

of other staff members who suggested that other approaches might prove to be worthwhile.

Also, judging from their manner of expression, they resented the people in the target groups who would not conform to their expectations, meaning that they blamed their own lack of success on the qualities of the people they served. One interesting illustration of this was provided by a staff member who complained that, although the poor could find transportation for some purposes, such as picking up food stamps, they were unwilling to make the same effort to get to the service centers.

Why had so many staff members made up their minds about how their community action should work in the face of evidence that it was not working?

Keeping in mind that most of this group was made up of professionals, or professionally-oriented non-professionals, they were applying their views of acceptable behavior (i.e., middle-class views) to the low-income individuals they were working with. They responded to their program, so should the poor too!

Also, we suspect that in some cases, the professionally oriented workers were confronted by a dilemma: they wanted to reduce the extent and consequences of poverty, but they were fearful of methods that offered more promise than those they were using.

When one of the non-professionals suggested that the essential goal was the simple one of organizing the poor to fend for themselves, a professional worker responded about as follows:

> Maybe you're right, but that brings up politics for one thing. We can get along like we are, but if the people we're working with kick up a fuss then the whole program is in trouble. A lot of 'big' people around here aren't going to put up with it. But we don't want trouble do we? Things are bad around here, but they could be worse.

An important but unstated issue is that many of the professionals on this community action staff are middle-class oriented people who associated with other middle-class and possibly even upper-class people. Too much identification with the poor, especially if the poor made effective efforts to voice their views and demands, might result in their

social isolation—or even worse. They might even have lost their middle-class standing and occupations.

A final point is that working with low-income individuals who are "different" in dress, speech, and attitude may be quite difficult for some professionals. If so, the tendency might be to try to pour the poor into a middle-class mold before attempting to relate to them.

Finally, it is important to note the consequences of a staff mixing both "professionals" and "non-professionals". If those who stress direct-contact with the poor (the non-professionals) succeed in generating interest in the centers' activities, once in the centers, the poor will be confronted by professionals who can easily defeat this interest with their middle-class expectations. A specific example is a reported instance in which non-professional workers recruited a group of nearly thirty people for an adult basic education class. Nearly all of the group withdrew from the class between its first and third meetings.

While we obviously are unable to generalize very widely about specific details of rural community action from this study of one action program, we believe it offers some insight into the broad problems which may exist among the staff members of considerable numbers of community action programs in Appalachia and elsewhere.

Confronted on one side by their perception of a community hostile to successful community action projects which depart from the middle and upper-class models, and confronted on the other side by the poor who are **different** and, hence, **difficult** to deal with, staff members may tend to retreat to conventional approaches which are ineffective in terms of the goals of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Futhermore, there is no evidence that any other groups or individuals within the county we have been describing are any more suited than the action program staff for effective community action leadership. We would hypothesize that such a limited pool of potentially successful community action leaders is not atypical of other rural counties and rural action programs in the Region.

The board of directors of the action agency constitutes a possible base for leadership but tends to be filled with local men-of-power or others responsive to them, and with

conservative, welfare-oriented professionals. Representatives of low-income groups serving on this and other rural boards like it are not likely to be influential without allies among other members of the board, and in any event are unlikely to be able to exert significant leadership because of attitudes of deference or withdrawal and inadequately developed interpersonal skills.

Such limiting characteristics are less likely to be found among low-income representatives serving on boards of urban action programs. In the urban setting there is a larger pool of aggressive, educated individuals among the low-income groups. In contrast, it is just such potential leaders who are most likely to migrate out of rural areas.

We would conclude that there are serious problems in Appalachian-type settings which impede the emergence of community action leadership from within any of the groups from which such leadership would normally be expected to come. Thus, despite the vital importance of effective action program leadership in the region, it seems no more likely to be achieved than the other two conditions necessary for community action success.

VI

An Adding Up

It is our opinion that the three conditions considered necessary for the success of community action programs tend to be met imperfectly in many instances, particularly in the Appalachian Region.

This conclusion is not intended to downgrade the concept of community action as it is expressed at present. Rather, the intent is to highlight the enormous difficulties which such programs may have to overcome if they are to achieve success. Such difficulties are inherent in the nature of any society.

Societies are constituted in such a way that they tend to resist change and there is little evidence that any conventionally classifiable component of society, except perhaps for a portion of organized labor and certain less influential groups, is eager to be identified with, let alone serve

in a leadership capacity, an effort to change established patterns of social status, position, or reward.

On the other hand, if the difficulties described cannot be overcome, the future of much of the Appalachian Region will continue to be as bleak as its past, because at present there seems to be no practical alternative to community action.

Traditional welfare programs have not solved the poverty problem and traditional policies aimed at the reduction of poverty through the operation of the market system have failed as well. Other policies, such as adequate direct income transfers to the poor in one form or another, may be adopted in the future, but even that occurrence may be hastened by community action.

Seemingly, it would be of value for the Office of Economic Opportunity to search for new approaches to the solutions of the problems which confront Appalachian and other rural community action programs. For example, it may be that greater amounts of expenditures for training community action program boards and staffs would be a highly productive investment leading to the development of more effective leadership. Indeed, this may be the only approach which offers promise of success, since the other two conditions probably must be taken as "givens" until the development of effective leadership is accomplished.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has its revolutionary aspect. That its administration should be criticized, or many of its programs appear to fall short of their goals, should not be unexpected. If it is to succeed, however, it must search for ways to solve the problems we have presented here.